

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/538,671

**Applicant(s)**

HAUG ET AL.

**Examiner**

KAREN YOUNKINS

**Art Unit**

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7-9, 11 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7-9 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-840)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/13/2010
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the claim language "a pair of jaws gripping an outer perimeter of the housing of the shower head between two diametrically opposed locations at a widest part of the housing of the shower head, the holder acting by means of an interference fit with the housing and permitting withdrawal and introduction of the shower head between the jaws, along a direction of the grip" as required by amended claim 1 was not found in the specification as originally filed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,091,998 to Peterson.

4. Peterson discloses a wall mounting comprising a shower head having a housing 22/20 and a grip 62 extending from the housing. The showerhead is in 'hand-held' form as a user may engage/disengage the showerhead via their hands for use. A holder 10 acts by means of an interference fit as claimed and is arranged between tines of a fork 72, 74. The holder acts to allow withdrawal and introduction of the shower head

between the jaws and along a direction of the grip (for example in the direction from front to back of 62 as shown in figure 1). The holder engages on the housing via a pair of jaws 82/84 gripping the shower head 22 at an outer perimeter between two diametrically opposed locations on the housing, see figure 1. The grip location is at a 'widest part' of the housing to the extent claimed, as the grip location (shown where jaws grip the shower head) is wider than any portion above the grip location (above the jaw location on the housing as shown in figure 2). The shower head is operational while the housing is engaged, and remains operational when withdrawn from the mounting and held by a user by the grip.

5. The initial statement of intended use, claim 1 lines 1-2, and all other functional implications related thereto have been fully considered but do not appear to impose any patentably distinguishing structure over that disclosed by Peterson.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of USPN 4,072,397 to Ross.

8. As previously discussed in pp-4 above, further Peterson fails to show the jaws being drawn toward one another when the shower head is in place, the jaws joined to the holder by a component that is under tension.

Ross teaches alternate clamp means known in the art of shower heads and shower head housings having jaws that are drawn together by a component that is under tension, See column 4 lines 30-34.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the wall mounting of Peterson to include jaws that are drawn together and held together under tension as taught by Ross to more securely clamp the shower head housing to the holder. It is noted that as modified, the tensioning component is 'configured such that it contacts the housing of the showerhead over an extended area' as it contacts the housing concentrically. It is further noted that the showerhead remains operational to emit water while engaged in the holder and when withdrawn from the mounting as functionally recited.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. Claims 15-16 are allowed.

***Response to Amendment***

11. Applicant's amendment filed to the pending claims is insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art and to overcome the rejections as discussed above.

***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as discussed above.

15. On page 7 the applicant has asserted that there is no basis to assert a routine combination of Peterson and Ross. The examiner respectfully disagrees, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the showerheads of Peterson and Ross are in the same field of the applicant's endeavor and are analogous art.

***Conclusion***

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAREN YOUNKINS whose telephone number is (571)270-7417. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571)272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. Y./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3751

/Khoa D. Huynh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3751